Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/531,414	LOSFELD ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	JASON L. SAVAGE	1794
All Participants:	Status of Application: <u>Amended</u>	
(1) <u>JASON L. SAVAGE</u> .	(3)	
(2) <u>MATTHEW KREMER</u> .	(4)	
Date of Interview: 19 June 2008	Time: <u>12:00</u>	
Type of Interview: ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative) Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No If Yes, provide a brief description:		
Part I.		
Rejection(s) discussed: N/A		
Claims discussed: Claims 13, 19 and 20		
Prior art documents discussed: Morimoto (US 4,729,871), Ishibe (US 6,355,082)		
Part II.		
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED: See Continuation Sheet		
Part III.		
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above. 		
(A	pplicant/Applicant's Representat	ive Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Examiner informed Applicant that the article claims reciting the first porous layer being a non-woven metal fiber fleece was allowable over the prior art but the prior art cited above were considered to meet the claim limitations of method claims 13 and 19-20. Applicant gave the Examiner permission to amend the claims to include the limitation drawn to the first layer being the non-woven metal fiber fleece..